

## **REMARKS**

With this response, Applicants submit a Request for Extension of Time to respond to the Notice of Panel Decision from Pre-Appeal Brief Review. Applicants believe that only one-month extension of time is due. However, if additional extension of time fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the Extension of Time fees to Deposit Account Number 50-2469.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1-6, 9-19, 21-23, 25-29, 32-35, 37-39, and 42-45 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,766,175 (“Uchiyama”) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0072544 (“Alexis”) at page 2 of the Final Office Action, which was mailed on July 27, 2005. The Final Office Action acknowledges that Uchiyama fails to disclose or suggest a universal serial bus (USB) interface to communicate with a first type of external device, as recited in independent claim 1. Similarly, Uchiyama fails to disclose or suggest communicating with an external device through a universal serial bus (USB) interface, as recited in independent claims 27 and 37. The Final Office Action states:

the examiner maintains that the feature a (sic) universal serial bus (USB) interface to communicate with a first type of external device was well known in the art as taught by Alexis.

*See Final Office Action, p. 3.*

Applicants disagree. Applicants submit that Alexis is not prior art to the present application, which was filed on June 24, 2003. Alexis was filed on July 9, 2003 and is a continuation-in-part of and claims priority from Application Serial No. 10/359,277 (“the ‘277 Application”) filed on February 6, 2003. The *Final Office Action* alleges that Alexis discloses a universal serial bus interface at page 12, paragraph 92 and at page 13, paragraph 114. However, Applicants note that the cited paragraphs were not present in the ‘277 Application. Moreover, the ‘277 Application fails to disclose or suggest a universal serial bus (USB) interface. Since the ‘277 Application fails to disclose or suggest a USB interface, the claim for priority in Alexis does not extend to the USB disclosure in Alexis. Therefore, Alexis is not prior art to the present application. Accordingly, the asserted combination of Uchiyama and Alexis is improper.

Accordingly, the rejection of claims 1-6, 9-19, 21-23, 25-29, 32-35, 37-39, and 42-45 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Applicants traverse the rejection of claims 7-8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Uchiyama in view of Alexis and further in view of Official Notice at pages 17-18 of the Final office Action. Applicants submit that for the reasons cited above, Alexis is not prior art and the asserted combination of Uchiyama and Alexis is improper. The Official Notice fails to cure the deficiency in the asserted combination. Therefore, the rejection of claims 7-8 is improper, and should be withdrawn.

Applicants traverse the rejection of claims 24, 36 and 46 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Uchiyama in view of Alexis, and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/011190 (“Harrison”). As previously discussed, the asserted combination of Uchiyama and Alexis is improper. Alexis is not prior art. The *Final Office Action* acknowledges that Uchiyama fails to disclose or suggest a USB interface. Harrison fails to make up for this deficiency. In particular, Harrison fails to disclose or suggest the use of a USB interface to communicate with an external device. Accordingly, Uchiyama and Harrison fail to teach or suggest each and every limitation of claims 24, 36 and 46, at least by virtue of their dependency from claims 1, 27 and 37. Furthermore, these dependent claims recite additional features neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited references.

### **Conclusion**

Applicants have pointed out specific features of the claims not disclosed, suggested, or rendered obvious by the references applied in the *Final Office Action*. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of each of the objections and rejections, as well as an indication of the allowability of each of the pending claims 1-19, 21-29, 32-39, and 42-46.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below if such a call would in any way facilitate allowance of this application.

Applicants submit that only one-month extension of time fees are due since the Request for Continued Examination is being filed within two months of the Notice of Panel Decision

from Pre-Appeal Brief Review. However, if it is determined that additional extension of time fees are required, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-2469.

Respectfully submitted,

1-11-2006

Date

  
Jeffrey G. Toler, Reg. No. 38,342  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
TOLER, LARSON & ABEL, L.L.P.  
5000 Plaza On The Lake, Suite 265  
Austin, Texas 78746  
(512) 327-5515 (phone)  
(512) 327-5452 (fax)